IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No. 16952 of 2004

For Approval and Signature:

HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE J.N.BHATT

==========

1	Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2	To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3	Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ?
4	Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the constitution of India, 1950 or any order made thereunder ?
5	Whether it is to be circulated to the civil judge ?

==========

VISHNUPRASADGANGADHARMISHRA - Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT &3 - Respondent(s)

==========

Appearance :

MR HARDIK C RAWAL for Petitioner No(s).: 1.
MRS MH RAWAL for Petitioner No(s).: 1.
MR. U.R. BHATT ASSISTANT GOVERNMENT PLEADER for Respondent No(s).: 1.
LAW OFFICER BRANCH for Respondent No(s).: 2.
MR JB PARDIWALA for Respondent No(s).: 2,3.

==========

CORAM :HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE J.N.BHATT

Date : 05/07/2005

ORAL JUDGMENT

.

1. Upon matter being called out today, ld. Advocate Mr. Hardik Raval for the petitioner states that in view of the reply filed and the stand taken by the High Court pursuant to which the case of the petitioner is under consideration, the petition on hand would not assume any survival value at this stage with a rider that so far as question of deemed date permission is concerned, liberty may be reserved. The ld. Standing Counsel for the High Court Mr. Pardiwala states that the point which is mentioned is yet not decided. Obviously, therefore, the submission with regard to giving of deemed date will remain open.

2. The ld. Assistant Government Pleader Mr. Bhatt under instructions states from the officer present in the Court that the proposal will be sent to the Gujarat Public Service Commission within a period of one week and thereafter, further process has to be undertaken by the said Commission. He has stated that as far as possible, the Government is interested to see that the process is expedited in view of the sensitivity of the proposed recommendation for the post of Deputy Registrars in City Civil Court.

3. The permission to withdraw is accorded with an observation that if the entire process is not concluded by the end of 31st August, 2005, it will be open for the petitioner to pursue further remedy. Petition, therefore, shall stand dismissed as withdrawn. Rule discharged with no order as to costs.

[DR. J.N. BHATT, J.]

#Dave